HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

WRIT PETITION (S) No. 2760 of 2007

PETITIONER : Bhagwati Prasad Dhruv Son of Shri Panchram Dhruv, aged about 56 years, Presently working as Headmaster, Govt. Middle School Datrengi, Block Bhatapara, District- Raipur (CG.). Resident of Hashmipara Bhathapara, District Raipur (C.G.)

VERSUS

RESPONDENTS : 1. State of Chhattisgarh, Through: The Collector, Raipur (C.G.)
2. The Senior Accounts Officer, Office of the Accountant General, Raipur (C.G.)
3. The District Education Officer, Raipur (C.G.)
4. The Block Education Officer, Bhathapara, District Raipur (C.G.)

WRIT PETITION UNDER ARTICLE 226 OF THE CONSTITUTION OF INDIA.

Single Bench : Hon'ble Justice Shri Satish K. Agnihotri.

Present: Shri Ashok Soni, Advocate for the petitioner.
Shri Arvind Dubey, Panel Lawyer for the State/respondent No. 1, 3 and 4.
Shri S.K.Beriwal, Advocate for the respondent No. 2.

ORDER
(Passed on 7th day of May, 2007)

1. Learned counsel appearing for the petitioner submits that as per the account slip (Annexure P/1) for the year March, 1999, it is indicated that the petitioner has withdrawn a sum of Rs. 25,000/- as P.F., Rs. 80,000/- as P.F. and Rs. 72,000/- as Temporary Advance.

2. According to the learned counsel appearing for the petitioner, withdrawal of Rs. 25,000/- in the month of May, 1998 from P.F. account is correct. So far as other withdrawals of Rs. 80,000/- and Rs. 72,000/- in the month of January 1999, and February 1999 are concerned, they are incorrect. The petitioner has not withdrawn any

(46)

amount as indicated in the account slip (Annexure P/1). The petitioner has accordingly made various representations vide letter Annexure P/3, P/4 and P/5. The respondent no. 2 has not made any enquiry in this respect.

3. The petitioner seeks permission of this court to make a representation requesting the authorities concerned to make verification from the relevant offices and banks. The submission of the learned counsel seems to be just and proper for which, the learned counsel appearing for the respondents have no objection.

4. Accordingly, the respondent no. 2 is directed to consider the representation if any, made by the petitioner, and to make proper enquiry in the matter as to how the amount has been shown as withdrawn from the account of the petitioner.

5. In view of the above, this petition stands disposed of. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge

Amit